DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 027 450 AC 003 326

National Workshop on Community Development Teaching and Research (April 1968).
Ontario Inst. for Studies in Education, Toronto.
Pub Date Apr 68
Note-52p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.70
Descriptors-*Community Development, Conferences, Curriculum Planning, Field Instruction, Financial Support, Government Role, Information Centers, Intercommunication, Job Placement, National Organizations, Regional Programs, *Research, Residential Centers, Resource Allocations, *Teaching, Urban Areas
Identifiers-Canada

The workshop reports on tasks, recommendations, and general implications for the study and practice of community development in Canada. Part one deals with recommendations and tasks arising in the areas of conferences and communication, community development as a field of study, training, field work, and survey and placement of workers. Recommendations include: provisions for an annual conference; definitions of the government role in community development; training programs emphasizing the human aspect; a greater sharing of resources between government and nongovernment agencies; establishment of regional training centers, pilot training programs, residential training centers, financial aid to students, systematic evaluation and research; and formation of a National Committee for Community Development, a national information center, and a directory of human resources in Canada in community development. Part two reports on discussion group results: on government intervention, urban development, subprofessionals, apathy of the population, hostility of community vested interests, loyalty problems, and a definition of the community development process. The appendixes include participant profiles, meeting agenda, proposal for a Canadian education research information system, and an experiment in developing teaching material. (pt)

ED 027 450

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

NATIONAL WORKSHOP ON COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT TEACHING AND RESEARCH

APRIL 1968

Department of Adult Education
The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
Toronto, Canada

AC003326

National Workshop on Community Development
Teaching and Research
April 1968

Department of Adult Education
The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
Toronto, Canada

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The planning committee for the workshop wish to extend their sincerest appreciation to those who participated in the workshop. We also would like to express our gratitude to Mrs. June Armstrong of OISE and her staff who greatly helped in the organization of the workshop; to all of the recorders and the group session leaders; and to Miss Colleen Ashworth, Mr. Arishid Ghazzali, and Mr. R.L. Faris for their assistance in the compilation of this Report.

Planning Committee:

W.B. Baker, Canadian Center for Community Studies

F. Bregha, School of Social Work, University of Toronto

J.A. Draper, Department of Adult Education, The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE)

J.M. Dufour, Indian Development Branch, Department of Social and Family Services, Government of Ontario

R. McEwen, Indian-Eskimo Association of Canada

R. Wiele, Department of Adult Education, OISE

FOREWORD

If participants to the workshop shared one common purpose for coming together, it was a desire to communicate with one another. If they shared one common feeling at the end of the workshop, it was a desire to extend that communication. Participants come and interact within a workshop setting not only to share information about programs, but also to test and clarify philosophies. A workshop of this kind is a forum intended to meet immediate and long-range interests. If interaction and communication terminated at the official closing of such a forum, then its value might rightly be questioned. The continuing interaction between participants and the effects which they may have upon the local community and upon the policy maker will determine the degree of success of this workshop. All this is in addition to the self-growth of the participants.

It would be presumptuous of any of us to say at this time whether the workshop has been successful. The importance of a workshop of this kind goes beyond its content. What is written between the lines with reference to tasks, recommendations, individual and group concerns has general implications for the study and practice of community education and development in Canada. This Report is a historical document indicating that a workshop took place. There are numerous documents of this kind. This group of workshop participants is not the only one who has found it convenient and felt it necessary to make recommendations and identify tasks. What makes the difference is the time and commitment and energy participants and others are willing to put into the implementation of what has been recommended and agreed upon in principle.

A few months ago someone said that "community development in Canada will be dead in ten years." On hearing this, I could only conclude that my personal reference points were quite different from those of the speaker. In practice, community education and development in Canada is as widespread as the country itself and as varied as its landscape. This is not surprising for communities and resources differ. One might argue that to say community development will die is like saying that communities will cease to grow, or that individuals within them will cease to be mutually involved in what is essentially an education process. I do not deny that community development in its present organization form and practice within and beyond government will drastically change in the next ten years. But obviously, in Canada, community education and development as a concept is not clearly understood and this lack of clarity essentially affects attempts to implement the concept at the grass roots level. There is little doubt that research needs to be done in the whole range of community education and development. This might include the evaluation of training, field, or other programs. It includes a study of the communication and decision-making processes, as well as the construction of curriculum programs, the testing of

appropriate methods, and the suitability of leadership patterns. Research on the subject would appropriately include the comparison of various methods and techniques of programs with reference to costs and effectiveness as well as production and distribution. The evaluation of materials and equipment, including the whole range of instructional audiovisual materials encourages detailed analysis. There seem to be two preliminary considerations when speaking of teaching and research. The one is the process of identifying and utilizing human and material resources. The other is that of the coordination of these resources.

If community development is seen essentially as a process of community and individual growth, then community education and development encompasses urban and rural settings, the isolated community, expanding cities, and majority as well as minority and sub-cultural groups. It would seem that any discussion on community education and development must consider the concepts of "leisure time" and "continuing education." The study of the subject of community education and development must of necessity take an interdisciplinary approach. What implications do the research and methodology of such disciplines as anthropology, sociology, social psychology, political science, social work, education and adult learning have upon the research and development of communities and community action?

The workshop attempted to be a national one. Geographically it did not achieve its purpose. Only in part, too, was it national in terms of representing completely and fairly the ideas developed and expressed by individuals and organizations across Canada. The challenge of continuing to share and to interact remains before us.

James A. Draper
September 1968

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments

Foreword

PART ONE: RECOMMENDATIONS AND TASKS

I Recommendations: National Workshop, April 1968 /1

A. Conferences and Communication
B. Development as a Field of Study
C. Training
D. Applied or Field Work

II Recommendations: Joint Study, April 1965 /3

A. Training
B. Organization

III Tasks Arising from the Workshop, 1968 /6

1. Conferences and Communication
2. Development as a Field of Study
3. Training
4. Community Development Workers - Survey and Placement

PART TWO: DISCUSSION GROUP REPORTS

A. Group I /10
Members
Report

B. Group II /12
Members
Report

C. Group III /17
Members
Report

APPENDIX I: PARTICIPANTS

A. Names and Addresses /29
B. Profiles /34

APPENDIX II

A. Agenda and Proposed Discussion Tasks/43
B. A Proposal for a Canadian Educational Research Information System (CEDRIC)/45
C. An Experiment in Developing Teaching Material /46

PART ONE

RECOMMENDATIONS AND TASKS

I. *Recommendations: National Workshop, 1968*

The participants of the workshop, in plenary session, made the following recommendations.

A. Conferences and Communication

1. That similar conferences should be held annually, under some or all of the following conditions:

   a) Another conference should last longer than two days and be residential.
   b) The location should be changed each year.
   c) Provision should be made to meet the needs of special interest groups.
   d) Position papers should be circulated in advance.
   e) Agendas should be more specific, with close integration of films and other outside resources.

2. That local groups be encouraged to work together on a regional basis in planning meetings, sharing information, developing resource directories, and so on.

B. Development as a Field of Study

1. That consideration be given to the development of a white paper on community development in Canada to serve as a base-line for further discussion, research, policy making, and program planning.

2. That with the assistance of non-government agencies, the role of government in community development should be more clearly defined. In this respect an attempt should be made to amalgamate the separate agencies' objectives so as to establish some cohesion in Canadian community development.

3. That community development as a field of study and research needs to become more interdisciplinary and to draw from the fields of education, sociology, anthropology, social work, and other disciplines.

4. That appropriate models for research and evaluation in community development should be developed. Action research should be built into community development programs and utilized to a much greater degree.

C. Training

1. That training programs for community development workers should emphasize more greatly the human aspect of development. More adequate training facilities should be established and training materials which are relevant to Canadian community development need to be developed. The training of community development workers should be conceived of as "continuous" rather than "terminal" and should provide for close integration of theory and practical experience in the field.

2. That coordination among government agencies should be facilitated for training purposes (e.g., workers from Manpower, Indian Affairs, Northern Affairs might attend the same training sessions).

D. Applied or Field Work

1. That there should be a greater sharing of human, physical, and mutual resources between government and non-government agencies.

2. That a systematic framework of evaluation should be incorporated into all community development programs.

3. That a greater emphasis should be given to the study of and expansion of urban community development.

4. That the planners of the Canadian Educational Resources Information Centers (CEDRIC) should be asked to include "community education" and "community development" in its classification system.

II. *Recommendations: A Joint Study, 1965*

The participants of the Joint Study made the following recommendations.

A. Training

1. Regional Training Centers

a) There should be created over the next five years a minimum of four Regional Training Centers; one in the Maritime Provinces, Quebec, Ontario, and the Western Provinces.

b) Though the composition of each of the Centers, in terms of specialized personnel, may differ in response to special regional interests and problems, each Center should be eventually capable of training all levels of personnel defined in this report.

c) A condition of support for such a Center should be the clear indication of the willingness of government, universities, and voluntary organizations to cooperate in planning and administration.

2. Pilot Training Programs

a) A series of pilot training programs should be organized immediately and completed within the next two years. Such programs should be so designed as to contribute to the development of Regional Centers.

b) These pilot training projects should be carried out in different regions and offer training at different levels for all sectors of clientele, as defined. They should be of varying type and duration and should be so defined and planned as to satisfy the needs of various types of programs and organizations for trained personnel.

c) In order to provide training for Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act (ARDA) personnel and persons from other government agencies and voluntary organizations as soon as possible, the National Committee should create a system of criteria permitting the recognition and subsidization of certain existing programs. In this way such programs, as well as new ones to be proposed by recognized organizations, may be easily and efficiently designated as pilot projects.

d) The National Committee should be charged with providing advice concerning the acceptance of such programs and with administering the proper cooperation and evaluation. The National Committee should be responsible for making the results of such evaluation available throughout the country.

3. Residential Training Centers

a) The creation of Residential Training Centers, such as those described or offered as examples in this Report, in which particular kinds of training can be carried out should be encouraged in Canada.

b) The financing of such Centers should be shared by Federal and Provincial governments as well as by voluntary organizations and other institutions.

4. Fellowships, Scholarships, and Grants

a) A system of financial aid to individuals at various and diverse levels of training is vital to the success of the entire Report.

b) Such aid should be made available by different means to the following: professors and senior trainers; students in generalist or sectorial training programs; undergraduates undertaking some form of apprenticeship; local leaders.

c) Very careful arrangements should be made so that the value of experience gained by recipients can be shared as widely as possible throughout Canada.

5. Research and Evaluation

a) A program of systematic evaluation and research on the training of personnel for community development should be undertaken as soon as possible.

b) This research should cover various aspects, such as: description and comparative evaluation of training now being carried out in Canada; the development of criteria for selecting candidates for training;in-depth investigation of such factors as duration, environment, and conditions of training; selected studies abroad.

c) Special care should be taken with the planning and reporting of such research in order to communicate it efficiently and swiftly to community development workers in Canada.

B. Organization

1. The National Committee

a) A National Committee for Community Development should be formed by the joint action of the Canadian Association for Adult Education (CAAE) and Institut Canadien d'Education des Adultes (ICEA), to be financed in part by the Federal government.

b) The members of this Committee should include representatives of governments, universities, and voluntary organizations.

c) The function of the Committee should be to advise the government on the distribution of fellowships, scholarships, and grants; to advise on the support of pilot projects in regional centers; to advise on research; to plan and administer the information center; to plan and assist in the evaluation of pilot projects; to plan and hold national and regional conferences on community development.

d) The Committee should be appointed on a provisional basis for two years. After that time its function and effectiveness should be re-evaluated, perhaps in conjunction with a national conference.

2. The Information Center

a) A national information center for the stimulation and coordination of training for community development in Canada should be created.

b) The center should, on a bilingual basis, engage in the publication of a regular bulletin; the publication of occasional research reports, program descriptions, and analyses and case studies; the collection, cataloging, and distribution of books and pamphlets on the subject of community development; the active contact with centers and activities abroad; the maintenance of a list of trained personnel in Canada.

c) The center should be undertaken immediately on the basis of the planned cooperation of the two existing libraries of materials presently maintained by the CAAE and the ICEA. With additional financing and careful supervision by a subcommittee, the National Committee can make this extra service available quickly and efficiently.

d) The Information Center should be evaluated at the end of the two year period in the same way as the National Committee.

III. *Tasks Arising from the Workshop (1968)*

The participants of the workshop identified the following tasks. Various members volunteered to work on particular tasks. The tasks and related reports, as to June 30, 1968, follow.

A. Conferences and Communication

Tasks	Task Member(s)
a) To prepare a complete report of the conference proceedings.	James Draper*
b) To investigate the possibility of securing funds for a conference in 1969 and to communicate with participants and others about holding another workshop sometime in 1969.	J. Frei* J. Draper

Report

The committee and some workshop participants have already begun to test the reactions of others regarding having another workshop in 1969. Participants and others are being asked for their comments about this and also for suggestions as to sources of funds for such a workshop.

	Task Member(s)
c) To investigate ways in which information relating to community development in Canada could be communicated. Possibilities might include: a special journal Canadian Association for Adult Education Canadian Research Center for Anthropology	Don Snowden* James Lotz David Nicholson

Report

The CAAE has indicated its willingness to explore further with the workshop committee the possibility of cooperating in producing a community education and development newsletter.

---

* Chairman of each Task Group

B. Development as a Field

Task	Task Member(s)
To consider ways in which a review of the literature (degree and non-degree) on community development and social change in Canada may be accomplished. This would include approaching organizations who could assist with this task, for example, the Department of National Health and Welfare.	James Lotz* James Draper

Report

The Welfare Grants Division, Department of National Health and Welfare does not, at present, consider that Community Development comes under their purview.

C. Training

Task	Task Member(s)
To develop a basic curriculum for community development training. Steps would include: (i) to identify what is presently being done in community development training; (ii) to collect information about training requirements and needs; (iii) to suggest ways in which these needs can be achieved.	Francis Bregha* James Draper J.M. Dufour James Lotz Ernie McEwen Fleurette Osborne W.J. Wacko

Report

The committee created for the study of basic curriculum in community development reviewed what type of information would be most useful for the purpose of establishing the current needs in the field and evaluating the effectiveness of past courses. With these two aims in mind, a draft letter to selected participants, government and private agencies, was circulated in September. By the end of October, the first exchange of preliminary findings is planned.

---

* Chairman of each Task Group

D. Community Development Workers - Survey and Placement

Task	Task Member(s)
a) To develop a directory of human resources with respect to community development in Canada. The directory would include a profile of community development supervisory field workers, teachers/ trainers, and research investigators.	James Draper*

Report

In early June, a letter and accompanying detailed Profile Information form was sent to all workshop participants. This material will serve as the basis for the directory. The directory is a continuing exploratory project and in fact is becoming a study of human community development resources in Canada. The feasibility of such a directory is still being tested. The identification of resources is paralleling a survey, already underway, which will identify graduate courses and programs in community education and development being offered in colleges and universities in Canada.

b) To investigate whether the Manpower office in Ottawa would be willing to assist in the placement of community development workers.	James Lotz*

Report

A question addressed to the Manpower Office in Ottawa revealed that they would provide the same services for the placement of community development workers as they do for other employees and employers.

---

* Chairman of each Task Group

Program: Tuesday evening, April 23

All participants were invited to a screening of films which had been developed by the National Film Board in their "Challenge for Change" program. The films selected were those produced in cooperation with Memorial University in Newfoundland.
Don Snowden of Memorial University and Don Duprey of the National Film Board introduced the films and led the discussions which followed their screening. The films emphasized that communication between individuals within a community and between that community and the outside world is a necessary prerequisite to social change.

Persons who would like to have further information about the program "Challenge for Change" should contact the National Film Board.

A. GROUP I

Chairman: Donald Snowden
Recorders: David Armstrong
Colleen Ashworth
Members: Benny Baich
Eric Beecroft
F. Bregha
Jim Draper
J. Lotz
Richard Ogmundson
Fleurette Osbourne
John Steele
Harold Willems

The session took as its first focal point the United Nations' definition of community development:

> ...the processes by which the efforts of the people themselves are united with those of governmental authorities to improve the economic, social and cultural conditions of communities, to integrate communities into the life of the nation and to enable them to contribute fully to national progress.

Discussion centered around the relevance of government authority in the Canadian context. It was agreed that all resources (human and material) must be tapped for community development, thus an enlargement of the U.N. concept of government resources is required. The symbol of an hourglass was introduced as an illustration of the role of the community development worker in interpreting the government to the people and, conversely, the wishes of the people to the government. Complimentarity must be the keynote of the relationship between government and the people. The United Nations' definition was thus accepted, with the above qualification, as a useful working definition of community development. The group was also reminded that the international aspect of community development must be kept in mind, particularly with reference to the adaptation of community development methods from a local situation to regional, national, and international conditions.

The relation between governments and community development was identified in five main areas: (1) policy-making, (2) administration, (3) finances, (4) training and (5) field workers. Since it was stated that government is inevitable it was also conceded that government intervention might be so considered. The main question to be asked therefore is: Under what conditions can government intervention be most usefully implemented? It was suggested that the area of training could benefit greatly by coordination among various agencies of government such as Manpower, Northern Affairs or Indian Affairs. The dichotomy between the philosophy and practice

of community development which is often evident in government programs, was recognized as a possible hindrance to the effective use of these resources. The fact that the government, in many instances, is not organized according to need but rather as a reaction to pressure could present another drawback.

Government involvement in community development was discussed briefly. A need was expressed for a loose and flexible structure, such as a crown corporation. It was suggested that workers involved in community development should be preparing models on which to base future government structures. Another need is for sensitive indicators to national conditions. This could be accomplished through the preparation of microstatistics by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics which could give information on problems in small areas of the country, as well as an overview of the entire nation.

The discussion then turned to the expressed priorities in community development. Urban development was recognized as a major problem area. It was suggested that the Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act has helped in the transition from a pre-industrial to an industrial society, and urban development must now be called upon to assist in the industrial post-industrial phase. The urban environment is already highly organized in the voluntary sector; what remains is to make governments at the local level more involved and responsive to change. One member of the group suggested that the introduction of political parties at the local level could provide an impetus for more effective action at this level.

A second emerging area of concern is that of extended professionalism. New professions which require new reactions from communities, are emerging at the "sub-professional" level. The use of local resources, including jobs for the disadvantaged, and a movement away from the concept of outside "expert" workers calls for new methods of training and skill upgrading.

The final minutes of the session focused on the role of the field worker. Several problem areas were identified including the following: the need to maintain balance and perspective; the problem of overidentification with one community; the feeling of frustration at the worker's inability to shape policy; the lack of professional access (the community development worker is usually isolated); the need for the worker to institutionalize his presence; and the difficulties arising out of conflict within the community. It was stated that the field worker's role depends to a great extent on the nature of the community itself so that a pre-defined role is not feasible in most circumstances.

B. GROUP II

Chairman: W.J. Wacko
Recorders: Leonard Shorey
Michael Brooke
Members: W.D. Baker
Alan Clarke
Gaetan Daoust
Marvin Lipman
Ernie McEwen
David Nicholson
Lionel Orlikow
R. Paine
Benzion Shapiro

Participants first raised for consideration a number of problems facing the community development worker:

i) the frequent apathy of those with whom he works;

ii) the hostility often encountered by the community development worker from those representing "vested interests" or holding important positions in the "power structure";

iii) the difficulty of preserving his loyalty to the "grass roots" if he was paid (employed) by a government or other organization;

iv) the frequent demand to "produce results."

The general feeling was that no simple answer to these recurrent problems was likely to be found since many of them related to the "context" in which the community development worker operated, that is whether he was employed by the "community" itself or by another and external agency which, conceivably, could have interests different from those of the community in which the community development person worked.

From this discussion it became clear that an important consideration was the need to define precisely the role of the community development worker. This problem was seen as being related to the question of training. In this context some subsidiary questions were raised:

i) How best can the community development worker be given a "recognizable" diploma which will increase his mobility by providing him with marketable qualifications acceptable across Canada? This was seen as an urgent need if the community development worker

was to escape some of the pressures that might result if he felt himself unable to move to another part of the country. Such a situation might constrain him to follow more unquestioningly the policy of any given employer.

ii) In what way could the training of community development workers be brought under the umbrella of the university? What sort of course content would be desirable for the worker and at the same time be acceptable to the university?

iii) How best could "theoretical" training and "field work" be meaningfully integrated to make a comprehensive and well-balanced training program? This point was considered particularly relevant where the same program of training had to meet the needs of persons already in the field but lacking a strong academic background, as well as persons who held degrees but lacked field experience.

iv) What training in research, if any, should be provided in such a training program?

v) What should be the basis of evaluation in such a training program?

A "specimen" curriculum for training community development workers was used as the basis for discussion. This curriculum emphasized three major concerns:

i) the need to train people for a variety of roles, with the basic emphasis being on how to help people help themselves;

ii) the need to "space" field work and theory;

iii) the need to provide simultaneously for people drawn from the "field" and for people entering the course directly from academic work, and totally lacking in field experience.

There was general agreement on the following:

i) that the "traditional" type of training did not adequately prepare people for effective community development work;

ii) that a multi-disciplinary approach was needed and that such a program should be so designed as to integrate effectively academic work and field work;

iii) that desirable as an "apprenticeship approach" might be, it might well prove difficult to make this both meaningful and practical since the needs of different communities - urban, rural, ethnic - could scarcely be met adequately by providing training in any one type;

iv) that in planning training programs there should be investigation of the possibility of exchanging students between universities so as to expose them to different situations and milieus.

There seemed to be general agreement about the following areas of concern:

i) that government-run programs were frequently less successful than they could be;

ii) that it was undesirable for a community development worker to be a civil servant;

iii) that issues relating to the precise role which the community development worker should play in his field were still in balance.

There was general agreement also that leaders in the field of community development work needed to move more rapidly to combat the increasing problems, and that greater sums of money were essential for the development of communities if community development work was to be really effective.

There was disagreement as to whether direct involvement and control by government was the most effective way of using government provided funds for community development.

An important but unresolved question was: Who should be responsible for the training of community development workers in any program established in the universities? Should they be planned by professors or directed by people in or from the field? Should portions of the course be "farmed out" to particular disciplines, or should the whole training course come under the direct control of one Department and, if so, which one? What should be the "level" of training provided?

Recommendations

Training

1. That training for community development work should be inter-disciplinary both at the university level and at conference level.

2. That the training program should emphasize work in discussion groups and this work should be closely integrated with field work.

Review of Literature

1. That The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) be asked (i) to undertake to make a review of community development literature available in Canada and (ii) that it be asked to keep such a bibliography up-to-date.

Future Conferences

1. That, in view of the usefulness of the present conference, steps should be taken to hold a similar one annually and that such conferences should be on a national basis.

2. That OISE be asked to accept responsibility for organizing a Conference in 1969.

3. That agendas for future conferences should be more specific.

4. That an attempt should be made to make more effective use of films at the next conference.

5. That it would be advisable for the next conference to be held elsewhere than in Toronto.

6. That it would be desirable for "working papers" to be circulated well in advance of the next conference date.

7. That, at the next conference, a "Workshop on Curriculum" should be a major aspect of the program planned.

8. That the next conference should, if possible, be residential.

9. That, generally, future conferences should be planned in terms of "areas of emphasis" so that participants need not commit themselves to remaining throughout the entire conference.

10. That a time-span of more than two days is needed for effective work at a conference of this sort.

C. GROUP III

Chairman: John Frei
Recorders: Robert Doyle
Hubert Campfens
Lucille Peszat
Adrienne Hunter
Members: Marilyn Assheton-Smith
Stan Bailey
Richard Capling
Allan Clark
Joe Dufour
Don Duprey
M. Skolnik
Edgar Smee

The session opened with a consensus that a definition of the community development process should evolve out of the discussion.

Community Change

The concept of community change was raised. It was discussed within Roland Warren's framework of "purposive change" at the community level. Change was seen to be related to three kinds of issues (defined as aspects or possibilities of purposive change which is the subject of active consideration among parties in a situation):

1. Issue consensus, or basic agreement. There is common interest arising out of common values. It also may be typified by situations in which interests converge, even though values differ.

2. Issue difference. There is a live possibility existing that consensus can be reached.

3. Issue dissensus. There is little chance either to develop an issue or to change value or interest - orientation of the opposing parties to achieve issue consensus.

Warren outlined the change strategies and professional roles pertinent to these issues as:

ISSUE	STRATEGY	ROLE
Consensus	Collaboration	Enabler
Difference	Campaign	Persuader
Dissensus	Contest (conflict)	Contestant

He saw community development essentially as a campaign strategy, out of which a consensus strategy for decision-making is projected into the future. The community development strategy seeks to activate and bring into relation to one another, all significant (community) parties to decision-making-organizing people to express their needs, consider action alternatives, and take action. One member noted that the campaign strategy is being increasingly related to "social animation"techniques which basically are educational and interpretive in nature. Two salient problems were identified:

1. The community worker must be conscious of his own attitudes vis-à-vis the "client system." He should be aware of the "risks" that he must be prepared to face, as well as his acceptance of the belief that people can be helped to help themselves.

2. The need to legitimize the organization of people (low-income population, minority groups, etc.) who do not normally participate in organizational activity. The worker should be able to confront the need of such groups to acquire power to influence decision-makers by involvement in political action.

Practice theory in community development was examined further. The topic of "goal setting" brought a consensus that goals should be set by the citizen group as the community development process "belongs" to the citizens, that is, based on their own preception of needs and problems. It was noted that some community organization agencies predetermine goals but such imposition is clearly at a polarity that was unacceptable to the members of the session. Clearby goals should be set internally (within the community by the citizen group) rather than alternatively by the external group.

Three principles of the community development process were noted: (i) it requires the involvement of citizens from the beginning; (ii) the ultimate decision must be reserved for the citizen group; (iii) it is not "selective," but is applicable in all community situations.

Citizen participation appeared to be important to several strategies for desired or purposive change. Citizens could gain access to decision-makers by individual efforts to assert rights; they could influence decisions by intervention in the political process; they might be involved in such innovations as the National Film Board "Challenge for Change" series. Through the use of the process of feedback, citizens could help to evaluate change, and thereby provide a source of information for policy-makers.

The Organizational Context

It was suggested that a typology of community organization agencies would indicate the vast differences that prevail with regard to a change-orientation. Some agencies have a narrow frame of reference, others are organized to allow for community self-determination (e.g., Alinsky's people's organizations).

Case Examples

A case example from Newfoundland was discussed. In a re-settlement program initiated by government to move people away from scattered settlements into the interior or more populated centers, the worker is faced with a predetermined goal. He may experience a role conflict - to assist in resettlement or to allow in some measure for self-direction by citizens. A continuum of imposed-self-determined change was set up. Other examples were offered to the session, but most lacked clarity in understanding the dilemma of the worker in situations where decisions have already been made for the community. No solutions were forthcoming, although the need for "sensitivity" to the situation was recognized; the community worker should not see people as "objects."

It was questioned if there can be a reconciliation or integration of the goals of the sponsoring agency and the community group. The process of "goal-definition" was seen as continuous; as goals are reached, other goals are identified in succession in a "spiralling" process.

The case examples raised the problem of community development intervention as an approach to solve regional problems. Whereas the real goal of community development is a change of the way the community system functions, the approach may be viewed as a way of conceiving the planning process as being rationalized by the fact that goals are defined by local populations and citizen groups, rather than by a community elite. Attention should be given to the fact that changes are necessary both on horizontal and vertical levels in the community. As people (citizens) become more socially competent, they can use the community development approach to intervene and solve problems at increasingly higher (vertical) levels of decision.

Terminal Relationship

It was conceded that there is a point at which the community worker must leave the community on its own. The separation should be a natural process as the citizen group discovers an increased capacity for self-determined action. The danger of the community worker controlling the process was noted. Some situations were recognized in which community organizers came to stir up a community only to make a hasty departure once the process was initiated. At this juncture, several members raised points in connection with the worker's joint responsibility with the citizen group in stabilizing change, and the need for his "sensitivity."

Research and Community Development

What is the role of research in community development? What kinds of research are applicable to community development? Which client system does research serve? Who should do it? When is it to be introduced?

Much of the discussion on research flowed naturally into attempts at conceptualizing community development. The report has been divided into those issues which deal specifically with research aspects of community development summarized below,and the more general items of community development recorded above.

For purposes of providing a conceptual framework for the research issues in community development, the group accepted the following concept of community development approaches as an operational guideline:

process orientation — task orientation (purposive change)

Continuum

goals, method, action — defined by people

preconceived plan open to change (problem is defined)

method, action — defined by people

Process orientation consists of an approach in which goals, action and method are all defined by the people themselves. Task orientation involves the presentation to the community of a pre-conceived plan, or the definition of a problem by an external agent (e.g. a governmental representative, or a voluntary agent). Action and methods of implementing are decided upon by the people. The continuum is to indicate that any combination of process-task orientation is possible with items on one end or the other, depending on the particular circumstances and objective of the community development program, the difference being principally one of the extent to which people of the community are involved in defining the problem.

The group recognized that the more process-oriented the community development program is, the greater the need for a research that is less rigorous than the conventional social science research approaches, i.e., community-based and action-oriented with a certain degree of involvement of local people in the research process.

Hence the two broad categories of research identified in relation to community development are:

1. Action-oriented research which is an ongoing process based on the particular needs of the present situation with adequate and a continuous feedback of information and facts from the operational levels to guide plans of development. It is a form of evaluative research insofar as it evaluates the immediate effects of the community development program on the community from stage to stage.

2. Sociological research (as one of the more conventional of the social science approaches), with a relatively "pure" approach to research carried out by specially trained experts, who place the community and the process of community development under the microscope. Generally, an elaborate research design is involved, including problem formulation, statements of proposition or hypotheses, and so on. This type of research provides theoretical understanding of guidelines useful for general orientation and purposive planning (if used), but is limited for its application to practical problems of the immediate situation and the dynamics of an ongoing process. Its use depends generally on the nature of the problem and the objective of the program of community development and is likely to be related to a specific aspect of community development. Some comments were made on the need for objective, evaluative research on the processes and methods of community development, and would appear to fall in this category (see further on in this report).

It was generally agreed that for the full attainment of community development objectives "action-oriented" research should be an integral part of any community development program. The steps in action-oriented research were conceived as:

1. Gathering relevant data related to the action process including observations and experiences of the community development practitioner.

2. Analysis and interpretation of the data by a research specialist (where applicable) or the community development team in the light of present situation and past factors.

3. Evaluation of the action against program, objectives, and discussion of alternative courses of action.

4. A decision that will guide the course of the process of community development.

5. Immediate feedback of results and recommendations into the community development process.

The key factor in this type of research is the focus on action with a continuous feedback from the local community level to modify the plan of development to meet the requirements and changing needs of the community. Thus, research is introduced from the very first point of contact with the community. The researcher should be always sensitive to how the plan or program will affect the community. Furthermore, being a closed research system or specific methodology (see steps outlined briefly above), action research should be equally applicable to programs of community development that stress "process" orientation or "task" accomplishment within the community development context.

The study group considered further which client system was to be served by research. It was felt that research operations are not only closely connected with the process or planning aspects of community development, but also with the ultimate objectives of the various client systems. These client systems were considered to be: a) the community, b) the community development practitioner, c) the governmental technocratic agency and d) the social scientist oriented researcher. In the evaluation of the community development process and its effect on the community, the community development team will have to distinguish, for example, between the community goals (which consist of immediate objectives related to program implementation as identified by the people themselves), and purposive change with objectives formulated and pursued by an external agent. One of the dilemmas discussed in this context was that of a conflict arising from a community wanting to pursue certain goals that would become an embarrassment to the political establishment or sponsoring agency. The critical question raised and to which no definite answers could be given, is, by what and whose criteria or indicators does one measure success or failure of community development? Some felt that most conflict situations of this type could be avoided through skillful use of the "community-based action-oriented" research process.

It might be useful and sometimes necessary, depending on program objectives of the external agency, to have prior and detailed knowledge of the community requiring a sociological approach toward research. This approach may at times backfire on the community development process. Some felt that researchers were not always able to interpret and explain their role adequately and satisfactorily to the community, and this often resulted in poor cooperation in data collecting. Others felt that such types of research may unduly raise the expectations of the community to a level that would be detrimental to the community development process. In particular, questions that touch upon

attitudes and feelings about community issues may be better surveyed as part of the action-oriented research and as an integral part of the community development process. Disproportionate, unexpected reactions or responses to evaluative or research questions, may then be channeled immediately into constructive outlets leading toward meaningful and purposive changes. In this sense research may be seen as a pragmatic tool of intervention in the problem-solving process of community development.[1]

Descriptive and ecological studies are useful and frequently necessary for general orientation prior to the launching of a community development program. They can be extremely helpful, as well, in carrying out one's role as a community developer. However, as some noted, such types of research do not always have to be carried out on the spot, as various governmental and other agencies may already possess much information on the particular community, acquired through census or other studies.

It was called to the attention of the group that the National Film Board has been experimenting lately with the use of films for community development. If properly executed and applied they could be used as a research tool, as well as a means of intervention in the community development process itself. Showing a community a film about itself may give it an opportunity to identify its own strengths and weaknesses through the eyes of an "objective" observer.

The film is particularly useful as a learning process. Some felt though, that if it is used as an interventive tool, extreme care should be taken, since its indiscriminate use could be detrimental to the attainment of community development objectives. The same caution applies to the sharing of the results of any researhc carried out by the community development team with the community. The information should be shared at the time the community is ready for it.

Another and final type of research was identified as most applicable, though perhaps of less use to the immediate situation. This kind of research aims at evaluating the processes and methods and different strategies of community development used in bringing

---

1 It would appear that the community developer, being in close contact with the people as a participant observer, is the one who best can perform most research functions feeding his observations and personal evaluations of the process of action and change into the community development team, thus assisting the latter to constantly redefine its plans accommodating them to changing needs and situations.

about purposeful change, measured against certain criteria and indicators. Here the interest is particularly in validating action theories developed by such men as Alinsky, Biddle, Ross, Warren and others. What action theory is most applicable to what setting? And what are the criteria developed by which the results are measured and upon which judgments are to be based?

Such types of "process and methods" research are urgently needed to consolidate the many experiments in social action and development carried out across the world, and to seek out the relevant from the irrelevant. Present practice in community development was seen as frequently based on a "trial and error" approach which made it difficult for an inexperienced community developer to determine priorities or the appropriateness of certain methods in specific situations.

A greater focus on this type of research would greatly facilitate training of practitioners new to the field. Validation of theories would also contribute to the development of general sociological theories useful to community development. And further, if carried out within the framework of the action research process, it could be of immediate use to the community development team in determining whether or not new action theories should be introduced in the community development process to guide the course of change. As much of the data necessary for process and methods research are already acquired through the action research process, no additional strain or pressures are applied to the community development process in order to serve the purposes of process and methods research. Some considered this type of research to be in the category of action research whereas others regarded it to be closer linked to the sociological type of research because of the need for more objective criteria than those required for a community-based action-oriented research.

In conclusion and summary the group identified five kinds of research related to community development.

1. Descriptive research of the demographic and ecological type for general orientation.

2. Expert consultation, based on some kind of research geared to the process of community development which may range from advice on technological matters to technical advice of a sociological or anthropological nature, etc.

3. Action research, which is community based and action-oriented, involving a two-way feedback process, evaluating continuously the effect of the planned program on the community and modifying and accommodating the plan to the changing needs and situation of the community.

4. Sociological research, placing the community and process under the microscope following the "pure" approaches to research.

5. Process and Methods research, validating action theories useful for training purposes, general sociological theory and of immediate use to guide the community development process when used as an integral part of action research.

The final session began with a discussion on the training of community development workers. It was agreed that such training involved three basic things:

i) the selection of community development workers;

ii) a broad general base of knowledge for everyone, plus special training for specialists;

iii) the concept of the process of community and social change from which arises the broad general base of knowledge.

Selection of Community Development Workers

This is the logical starting point in a training program. The qualities of a community development worker would be the following:

- an ability to interpret behavior in terms of social dynamics rather than judgmentally;
- an ability to talk and listen to people;
- social concern (this would require seeing the community development worker in more than a one-to-one situation but in a group situation as well);
- ability to cope with stress and pain in self and others;
- attitude of optimism;
- ability to see people as unique rather than as stereotypes;
- an open personality;

- ability to disagree, respect, and appreciate the values of others;
- ability to see both universality and differences in communities;
- insight, sensitivity, perception;
- ability to perceive the reactions of others;
- authenticity;
- trustworthiness;
- avoidance of maternalistic and paternalistic attitudes;
- ability to empathize.

Several methods of selection were mentioned:

(a) Dr. Riesman of Lincoln Hospital, New York City, (a mental hospital in the Bronx) has developed a method of selection of indigenous workers for a program of community psychiatry. It was suggested that contact be made by OISE for members of this group concerning information and papers from Dr. Riesman.

(b) The community might suggest what worker it wanted, since someone else usually selects workers (e.g., village level workers in Indian communities); the community might play viable and active role in hiring change agent; the first step in training village workers chosen by the community would be to meet with leaders to identify goals for one year before choosing worker.

(c) Montreal has been using indigenous workers for three years. For further information: Peter Katavopis, 355 St. Urbain, Montreal, Quebec.

Basic Curriculum

1. Technical skills - extension of modern communication (audiovisual media).
2. Basic understanding of means of communication.
3. Problem solving skills.

4. Conflict resolution.

5. Balance and sequence between practical and theoretical training.

6. Understanding of theoretical concepts and dynamics of society and the community's systems (i.e.,understanding of the relationship between microcosmos and macrocosmos)

7. Use of simple language and ability to translate terminology.

8. Basic information concerning the collection and use of information collected in the field.

9. How to assess and use available resources, both human and physical.

10. Training and pertinent instruction in the role of the community development worker within the framework of the conceptual model developed by the group.

11. How do you answer the question: Why are you here?

Social Change

In a community, there is a built-in change process. Why then a community development worker? To stimulate the growth of the community. In the change process, the necessary steps include:

1. Authenticity of personality on the part of the community development worker.

2. Contact with people.

3. Building of relationships and rapport. One of the important elements in this is the ability to conceptualize and "do" in terms people can understand.

4. Commitment - on part of community development worker and the community.

5. Diagnosis of the situation by the group (of which community development worker is member).

6. Forming alliances. The organization should be a method of communication which is flexible and an open system.

7. Evaluation of individuals. The community development worker must be able to recognize those persons in the community with whom he can work effectively. This would vary according to the community development worker. He must also recognize who are the potential leaders who will take over from him when he leaves.

8. Instruction by community development worker in leadership skills (i.e., the process he himself has just gone through).

9. Repetition of the process continually.

The group came to no conclusions about who should train community development workers nor where they should be trained, although there was some discussion about the three approaches to training:

(a) field (in-service)

(b) academic

(c) institute (integration of theory and practice)

The general feeling, however, was that in-service training at some point was essential.

There was discussion as to whether or not a "certificate" was necessary. Opinions were expressed that Canada is paper conscious, and that a certificate gives one a sense of security: on the other hand, is it necessary in order to justify oneself in a community? No consensus was reached.

The principle of maintaining future contact was accepted by all members of the group. A newsletter containing all the regional resources was suggested, and many expressed a willingness to participate with Dr. Draper in some of his research projects.

APPENDIX I

A. PARTICIPANTS - NAMES AND ADDRESSES [1]

Miss Marilyn Assheton-Smith
Company of Young Canadians
Yellowknife, N.W.T.

Mr. Benny Baich
Company of Young Canadians
43 Gladstone Crescent
St. Albert, Alberta

Mr. Stan Bailey
Regional Supervisor Social Programs
Indian Affairs Branch
Ontario Regional Office
Medical-Dental Building
1849 Yonge Street
Toronto 7, Ontario

Dr. W.B. Baker
President, Canadian Center for Community Studies
Suite 1103 - 151 Slater Street
Ottawa 4, Ontario

Dr. Eric Beecroft
Chairman
Canadian Council on Urban & Regional Research
Department of Political Science
University of Western Ontario
London, Ontario

Professor F. Bregha
School of Social Work
University of Toronto
Toronto 5, Ontario

Mr. Richard Capling
Special Consultant
Community Programs Branch
Department of Education
559 Jarvis Street,
Toronto 5, Ontario

---

1 Addresses given are those as of April 1968
Profiles included are those received up to April 1968.

Mr. Allan Clark
Associate Director
Indian-Eskimo Association
277 Victoria Street
Toronto 2, Ontario

Mr. Alan Clarke
Executive Director
The Company of Young Canadians
323 Chapel Street
Ottawa 2, Ontario

Mr. Gaetan Daoust
Canadian Council on Rural Development
Sir Guy Carleton Building
161 Laurier Avenue West
Ottawa 4, Ontario

Dr. James A. Draper
Department of Adult Education
The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
Toronto, Ontario

Mr. J.M. Dufour
Head, Indian Development Branch
Department of Social and Family Services
5th Floor
Hepburn Block
Parliament Buildings
Toronto, Ontario

Mr. Don Duprey
National Film Board of Canada
Box 6100
Montreal 3, Quebec

Dr. John Frei,
Executive Director of Montreal
Council of Social Agencies
1040 Atwater Avenue
Montreal 6, P.Q.

Mr. Thomas L. Haley
Counselling Consultant
The Canadian Research Centre for Anthropology
St. Paul University
40 Riverdale Avenue
Ottawa 1, Ontario

Mr. Marvin Lipman
Architectural and Planning Division
Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation
Head Office
Ottawa 7, Ontario

Professor James Lotz
Research Professor, Community Development
and
Associate Director
Canadian Research Centre for Anthropology
St. Paul University
223 Main Street
Ottawa 1, Ontario

Mr. Ernie McEwen
Executive Director
Indian-Eskimo Association of Canada
277 Victoria Street
Toronto 2, Ontario

Mr. David Nicholson
Youth Branch
Ontario Department of Education
559 Jarvis Street
Toronto 5, Ontario

Mr. Richard Ogmundson
Canadian Council for Urban and Regional Research
Suite 308
225 Metcalfe Street
Ottawa, Ontario

Mr. Lionel Orlikow
Department of Educational Administration
The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
Toronto, Ontario

Miss Fleurette Osborne
Regional Community Development Worker
Indian Affairs Branch
Department of Indian Affairs and Northern
Development
1849 Yonge Street
Toronto 7, Ontario

Dr. Robert Paine
Head, Department of Sociology and Anthropology
Memorial University of Newfoundland
St. John's,Newfoundland

Dr. Ben Zion Shapiro
School of Social Work
University of Toronto
Toronto, Ontario

Mr. M. Skolnik,
Institute of Social and Economic Research
Memorial University of Newfoundland
St. John's,Newfoundland

Mr. Edgar E. Smee
Regional Liaison Officer
Citizenship Branch
150 Main Street West
Room 523
Hamilton, Ontario

Mr. Donald Snowden
Director of Extension Service
Memorial University of Newfoundland
St. John's, Newfoundland

Mr. John R. Steele,
Associate Director, Programs
Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Branch
Department of Agriculture and Food
Parliament Buildings
Toronto, Ontario

Mr. Ernest Taylor
Community Development Services
877 Portage Avenue
Winnipeg, Manitoba

Mr. William J. Wacko
Research and Training Officer
Community Development Branch
1721 Centennial Building
Edmonton, Alberta

Mr. Harold Willems
Director, Staff Development
Ontario Department of Social and
Family Services
Hepburn Building
Parliament Buildings
Toronto, Ontario

B. PROFILES

Marilyn I. Assheton-Smith

Marilyn I. Assheton-Smith, Project Staff Worker with the Company of Young Canadians received her M.P.H. degree in Health Education from the University of Minnesota.

Prior to her present appointment, she was Health Educator with the Federal Government Health Services. In this position she was responsible for assisting in the training and supervision of Native Community Health Workers for Indian Communities.

At present, she is concerned with training and assisting volunteers engaged in community work around the Great Slave Lake area.

Mr. Benny Baich

Mr. Benny Baich, Coordinator, Lesser Slave Lake Association project is serving with the Company of Young Canadians. He is responsible for coordinating the efforts of field workers in Alberta.

Previously, he was a Conservation Officer and also worked with the Metis Indians.

Dr. William B. Baker

William B. Baker, President, Canadian Centre for Community Studies, received his B.S.A. from the University of Saskatchewan. He did Graduate Studies in rural sociology at the Universities of Minnesota and Kentucky, Sociology and Social Psychology at the University of Michigan. He holds an honorary Doctor of Laws from North Dakota State University.

Before accepting his present appointment, Dr. Baker was Director, School of Agriculture, University of Saskatchewan; Professor of Rural Education, University of Saskatchewan. In 1952-56 he was Chairman, Saskatchewan Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life and from 1957-64, Director, Centre for Community Studies. Dr. Baker was Consultant on Adult Education to the University of New England, New South Wales, Australia, and toured community development programs in India on invitation from the Carnegie Foundation.

Dr. Francis J. Bregha

Francis J. Bregha, Professor, School of Social Work, University of Toronto studied Law and Economics at Charles University in Prague and later Economics and Social Studies at Laval University in Quebec.

Dr. Bregha came to community development through several years of work in Europe and in Latin America, related to post-war reconstruction in the first area and to economic development in the second.

Prior to his present appointment, he was Director for Andean Region of the International Development Foundation.

At present he teaches Community Development,Community Organization and International Social Issues at the Master's and Doctoral levels in Social Work.

In research, he is engaged in the study of participation in community political processes in Canada and supervises a group of students preparing a research paper on the deviant youth sub-culture in Yorkville, Toronto.

R.G. Capling

· Mr. R.G. Capling, Special Consultant, Community Programs, Ontario Department of Education, received his B.A. from the University of Western Ontario and is at present completing his M.Ed. degree in Adult Education at The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Mr. Capling, a certified Y.M.C.A. Secretary worked for the Y.M.C.A. in Kitchener and Hamilton for nine years. While in Hamilton, he supervised work related to a Community Development project with a group of disadvantaged children.

His present interests include the coordination and design of residential training programs in Community Development for Community Volunteers.

George Allan Clark

George A. Clark, Associate Director, Indian-Eskimo Association of Canada, Toronto, Ontario. He received his B.A. (Sociology) from the University of Toronto in 1962.

He has served as community development officer in Norway House, Manitoba and worked with the Edmonton Welfare Council on municipal planning and social migration (Indian).

He is particularly interested in the use of the mass media as instruments of social change, and the study of cultural factors operative in the change process.

Dr. James A. Draper

James A. Draper, Professor, Department of Adult Education, The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, received his B.A. and Teaching Certificate from the University of British Columbia and his M.Sc. and Ph.D. from the University of Wisconsin, U.S.A.

Dr. Draper taught public school for two years before going to Wisconsin and while studying at Wisconsin served as a staff member for four years in the University Extension Department of that University. From 1964-66, he worked as a staff member of the University of British Columbia as a Colombo Plan Project Advisor to the University of Rajasthan in India. During the winter of 1966-67, he directed a community study for the Welfare Council in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan.

Dr. Draper teaches a graduate course in Community Education and Development. His interests include work with Canadian Indians, and the development of training programs.

Donald Duprey

Donald Duprey, Senior Coordinator - Challenge for Change Program, National Film Board of Canada, Montreal, Quebec. He received his B.A. and Education Certificate at the University of Manitoba, and has also completed pre-M.A. studies in History and Geography.

After two years of high school teaching in Winnipeg he worked with the National Film Board (Utilization and Distribution) in Toronto.

Dr. John W. Frei

John W. Frei, Executive Director, Montreal Council of Social Agencies, Quebec, received his M.S.W. from McGill, and his L.L.D. from Charles University of Prague.

Dr. Frei has lectured in "Administrative Practises" at Charles University, and is an Honorary Lecturer, McGill, and a Lecturer, Universite de Montreal, Ecole de Service Social.

Some of his most recent papers are: "Problemes des quartiers deteriores" une conference presentee a la Conference annuelle de l'Institut Canadian des Affaires Publiques (Mont Gabriel, 1967), and "The Impact of Urbanization," Chapter 1, Canadian National Committee Report, Thirteenth International Conference of Social Work, Washington, D.C. 1966), ed. A. Rose (May, 1966).

He has been active in community work. He was President of the Board of Directors, Y.M.C.A. (Prague), and Member of the International Committee for Scientific Organization, among similar positions in Europe. He is presently a Member of the Canadian Welfare Council.

Thomas L. Haley

Thomas L. Haley, Research Associate (Community Development), Canadian Research Centre for Anthropology, St. Paul University, Ottawa, Ontario. He attended Temple University (Business Administration) and has done further study at Sir George Williams, and St. Paul Universities. His current interests are in social research, and the creation of jobs for so-called "unemployables" in Lower Town East Urban Renewal, Ottawa. Here he established and taught classes for the undereducated.

Marvin Lipman

Marvin Lipman, an employee of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, is completing a doctoral program at the School of Social Work, University of Toronto.

Mr. Lipman's doctoral research is in the area of urban renewal and relocation of families because of urban renewal. He is interested in citizen involvement in urban renewal areas, social action ,and social change generally.

Prior to his present employment, he was engaged in Child Welfare in Ontario and the United States.

Dr. Jim Lotz

Jim Lotz, Research Professor (Community Development) and Associate Director, Canadian Research Centre for Anthropology, received his B.A. and M.Sc. from St. Paul's College, Ottawa, and did his post-graduate work at the University of British Columbia.

Dr. Lotz worked as a trader in West-Africa and did research in Physical Science in the Canadian Antarctic and High Arctic. In addition he had service with the Department of Northern Affairs and

National Resources as Community Planning Officer and Research Officer.

His major interests are Social, Cultural and Applied Anthropology and Community Development. His field of operation is particularly the Yukon, Northwest Territories, and Northern Ontario.

Ernie R. McEwen

Ernie R. McEwen, Executive Director of the Indian-Eskimo Association of Canada, received his B.A. from the University of Manitoba and is also a graduate of the University of California in Theology. He is a certified teacher and has had special courses and experience in group work and adult education.

Mr. McEwen's work experience includes teaching school for 3 years, and service with the R.C.A.F. Education Branch. In addition, he was Assistant Director, Canadian Youth Commission (2 years), Head of Recreation and Youth Services Division, Canadian Welfare Council (5 years) and Director, Research and Training R.C.A.F. Recreation Branch (9 years).

His other activities include positions as: Executive-Secretary, Canadian Committee World Assembly of Youth, Executive-Secretary, Canadian Committee of Youth Serving Agencies; and a Canadian Delegate to UNESCO World Conference on Eradication of Literacy, Tehran 1965.

Richard Ogmundson

Richard Ogmundson, Research Associate, Montreal Council of Social Agencies, received his B.A. from the University of Victoria.

Mr. Ogmundson was Research Assistant at the Social Science Research Centre of University of Victoria and Research Officer, Canadian Centre for Community Studies. In February 1968, he was on loan to the Canadian Council on Urban and Regional Research as Program Officer.

In his present appointment, Mr. Ogmundson will assist the Executive Director in his research and will also do independent circulation of the urban Social Redevelopment Project in Montreal.

Lionel Orlikow

Lionel Orlikow, Department of Educational Administration, OISE received his M.A. from the University of Manitoba in 1955 and his M.Ed. from Harvard in 1956. He completed his doctoral course requirements from the University of Chicago in 1965.

Mr. Orlikow has acted as an evaluator for the Company of Young Canadians. He is interested in organizational links between parents and schools, education and socioeconomic functional areas in meeting poverty, the multi-problem family, and Indians and integrated education.

Miss Fleurette Y. Osborne

Miss Fleurette Y. Osborne, Regional Community Development Worker, Indian Affairs Branch, Toronto, received her B.A. from Sir George Williams in 1963 and her M.S.W. from McGill in 1965.

She has served as a research aid in an urban social redevelopment project in Montreal and a trainer and consultant with the Indian Affairs Branch, Toronto. She is a member of the International Society for Community Development.

Dr. Robert Paine

Robert Paine, Director of Social Research, Institute of Social and Economic Research, Head of Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Memorial University of Newfoundland received his B.A. (Hons), M.A., Dip. in Social Anthropology, B.Sc., and D. Phil. from Oxford University.

He was a British Council Scholar to Norway and a Graduate Assistant, Institute of Social Anthropology, University of Oxford. In addition, the Alan Coltart Anthropological Scholar, Exeter College, University of Oxford.

Dr. Paine was a Fellow of the Norwegian Research Council for Science and Humanities and of the University of Bergen: Research and teaching.

His main responsibility in connection with community development is that of planning a program at the Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Dr. Ben Zion Shapiro

Ben Zion Shapiro, Assistant Professor, School of Social Work, University of Toronto, received his B.A., M.S.W. and D.S.W. from the University of Toronto.

Dr. Shapiro is a former Lecturer, School of Social Work, Waterloo Lutheran University. Prior to this he was Director, Camp Shalom (Canada), Supervisor and Field Instructor, University Settlement (Toronto), Program Director, St. Christopher House (Toronto), and Director, Novomeysky Youth Centre (Jerusalem).

His present teaching responsibilities include instruction in the "Dimensions and Methods of Social Work Practice," "Community Organization Theory and Practice" and "Group Development for Indirect Intervention" (Doctoral students).

Michael Skolnik

Michael Skolnik, Assistant Professor of Economics, Research Fellow, Institute of Social and Economic Research, Memorial University of Newfoundland, received his B.A. from Arizona State University, did his postgraduate work at the University of California (Berkeley) and obtained his B. Phil. from Oxford University.

Before his present appointment he was a Member of the Federal-Provincial Task Force for Rural Development Planning for Newfoundland.

At present Mr. Skolnik is teaching a course in "Social and Economic Development" which is an ambitious attempt to integrate economic development theory, applied social anthropology, and community development theory, and empirical material.

Ed. Smee

Ed. Smee, newly appointed Regional Liaison Officer, Citizenship Branch (Hamilton), Department of Secretary of State, is a graduate of Sir George Williams University. In 1963-64, he participated in the Human Relations Training Program held in Bethel, Maine.

Mr. Smee was in private business for 14 years and spent 20 years with the Y.M.C.A. where he directed the Lanark County Community Development Project. In addition, he had 10 month's service with the Company of Young Canadians as a Coordinator dealing with the Selection and Training of Volunteer Workers.

His present position involves consultation, teaching, organizing and stimulation of action around issues.

Donald Snowden

Donald Snowden, Director of Extension at Memorial University of Newfoundland, graduated from Carleton University in 1949.From 1954-1964 he served in the Department of Northern Affairs and subsequently as Chief of the Industrial Division. There he was mainly responsible for developing interdisciplinary surveys of Arctic regions.

Mr. Snowden organized the first Arctic cooperatives whose purpose was to provide the Eskimos with tools for the development of capacity to govern themselves. Publication of some of the results of this work appeared in the *New Yorker* magazine.

John R. Steele

John R. Steele, Associate Director (Programs), ARDA Branch, Ontario Department of Agriculture and Food, Toronto, Ontario. He received his B.Sc. (Animal Husbandry) from McGill University in 1962.

He first served as an Assistant Agricultural Representative - Junior Extension and then an Agricultural representative - Agricultural Extension and Farm Management Training. He had two years experience in Perth, Ontario, as a Rural Development Officer.

His chief interests include group dynamics approaches to problem-solving, and communications processes.

W.J. Wacko

W.J. Wacko, Research and Training Officer, Community Development Branch, Department of Industry and Development, Alberta, received his B.A. from the University of Alberta and his M.S.W. from the University of Toronto.

Mr. Wacko was a Psychiatric Social Worker in Alberta and London,England. He spent ten years with the Alcoholism and Drug Addiction Research Foundation in Ontario.

Prior to his present appointment, he had service for two years as a Community Development Training Officer with the Indian Affairs Branch.

In his present post, Mr. Wacko is organizing various types of leadership training courses or conferences for native people with the emphasis on joint efforts of Treaty Indians, Metis and non-Indians. In addition he is engaged in training for Community Development and Indian Affairs Branch staff.

Harry A. Willems

Harry Willems is Director of Training and Staff Development, Ontario Department of Social and Family Services, Toronto.

He received his teaching certificate from the Saskatoon Teachers College in 1942, his B.A. from U.B.C. in 1949 and his S.W. from U.B.C. in 1950. He was granted his M.S.W. from U.B.C. in 1952.

Mr. Willems was the Director of Regional Welfare Services, Department of Social Welfare, Saskatchewan, from 1959 to 1966.

He has studied "Community Organization and Poverty" at Columbia University, summer 1965, and "Ethical Problems in Contemporary Economics as Relating to Community Development" at the University of Saskatchewan, 1965-66.

APPENDIX II

A. AGENDA

Tuesday, April 23, 1968

7:30 p.m.	screening of selected material from the National Film Board "Challenge for Change" Program

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

9:00 a.m.	Registration
9:15 - 10:00 a.m.	Plenary session - Chairman: Dr. J. Draper -Introductory Remarks:Dr. J.R. Kidd, Chairman, Department of Adult Education, OISE -Outline of the Workshop procedure
10:00 - 10:30 a.m.	Break
10:30 - 12:15 p.m.	Discussion Groups
12:15 - 1:30 p.m.	Lunch
1:30 - 3:00 p.m.	Discussion Groups
3:00 - 3:15 p.m.	Break
3:15 - 4:30 p.m.	Plenary Session - Chairman: Mr. E. McEwen -Group Reports -Review of tomorrow's agenda
5:00 - 7:00 p.m.	Reception: Park Plaza Hotel

Proposed Discussion Tasks

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

1. Identify what you consider to be the major problem areas for community development work in Canada.

2. What are the major problem-types or difficulties encountered by:
   a) the field worker
   b) the trainer/teacher
   c) the researcher
   d) the administrator (university, government, voluntary organization, private institution)

   engaged in community development in Canada?

3. Discussion of any relevant topic.

Thursday, April 25, 1968

9:00 - 9:30 a.m.	Plenary Session - Chairman: Mr. J. Dufour -Report: Mr. John Shearman, Librarian,OISE -Outline of group tasks
9:30 - 10:30 a.m.	Discussion Groups
10:30 - 10:45 a.m.	Break
10:45 - 12:15 p.m.	Discussion Groups
12:15 - 1:15 p.m.	Lunch
1:15 - 3:30 p.m.	Plenary Session - Chairman: Dr. J. Draper -Group reports -Recommendations, resolutions, etc.

Proposed Discussion Tasks

Thursday, April 25, 1968

Certain problem-types or difficulties can be resolved by an awareness of existing resources available at another level of activity or elsewhere within one's own level.

1. Which of the problem-types or difficulties identified at:

   a) the field worker level
   b) the trainer/teacher level
   c) the researcher level
   d) the administrator level (university, government, voluntary organization, private institution)

   could be eliminated or alleviated by inter-level and/or intra-level communication?

2. How could effective channels of communication/cooperation be established among these levels of community development endeavor or within each of its levels?

3. What immediate steps can we take to initiate action in this sphere?

4. What role can you or your organization play in assisting the development of effective communication?

5. In an effort to bring about tangible results from these decisions, what potential deadlines for the tasks and the responsibilities assumed, arising from the preceding discussion can be set?

6. Discussion of any relevant topic.

B. A PROPOSAL FOR A CANADIAN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH INFORMATION SYSTEM - CEDRIC

The Library of The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education is proposing to undertake a two-year pilot study that will test the desirability and possibility of developing a system to collect and disseminate information about educational research and innovative practices in all phases of Canadian education. The functions of the proposed system will be to collect, primarily in document form, all available information regarding educational research and the development of educational innovations, to process this information so that it may be made more readily available to all who may have need of it, and to disseminate it as widely as possible to educators, administrators, researchers, and others concerned with education. If successfully developed, the system will be linked with the U.S. Office of Education's ERIC system to provide the beginnings of an international educational information network. Uniquely Canadian problems such as bilingualism, federalism, and provincially administered educational systems will be given special consideration during the research project.

Presentation made by: Mr. John Shearman, Librarian, OISE, Toronto.

C. AN EXPERIMENT IN DEVELOPING TEACHING MATERIAL

Persons who are primarily concerned with the teaching and training aspect of community education and development are acutely aware that there are very few audiovisual materials suitable for instructional purposes. Furthermore, there is a great need in the field to experiment with various medias and technologies. Generally speaking, technical equipment is very often readily available. What is lacking is the "software," the in-put material which can be used in the equipment.

On an experimental basis, and with the technical assistance of the University of York, Toronto, two half-hour video tapes were made by some of the workshop participants. The purpose of these productions was to experiment with the development of audio-visual teaching materials in the area of community education and development. Details of the two video tapes might be summarized as follows:

Series: Part 1
General Topic: A discussion of some of the basic concepts and principles of community education.
Participants: Benny Baich
James Draper (host)
James Lotz
Ernie McEwen

Series: Part 2
General Topic: A discussion of some of the basic problems of a community worker.
Participants: Benny Baich
James Draper
Joseph Dufour
William Wacko

Inquiries about these and other audiovisual material relating to the topic of community education and development should be directed to the Department of Adult Education, OISE.

ERIC Clearinghouse
JAN 14 1969
on Adult Education